

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-21 will be pending. By this amendment claims 1-19 have been amended, and claims 20 and 21 have been added. No new matter has been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-18

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Horisawa *et al.* (WO99/34594; hereinafter referred to as “Horisawa”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was indicated that “[i]n enabling high-speed processing of separating multiplexed signals obtained by a plurality of multiplexing methods, a problem occurs in that the number of adaptable multiplexing methods must be limited, or processing software and hardware must be enlarged when the number of adaptable multiplexing methods is not limited.” *Specification, page 2, lines 16-21.*

To address the above-described problem, the structure of independent claim 1, as presented herein, discloses an information processing apparatus including “a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information”, and “a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods”. *Claim 1 (emphasis added).*

Although it seems Horisawa discloses a set top box having a front end adaptable to receive “different kinds of communication media”, it fails to teach or suggest having a storage

element that can store multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method from the different methods stored in the storage element.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Horisawa. Independent claims 8 and 15 are method and computer program claims, respectively, which include limitations that closely parallel, and are substantially similar to, the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, it is maintained claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by the teachings of Horisawa. Further, since claims 2-6, 9-13, and 16-18 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, it is maintained that claims 2-6, 9-13, and 16-18 are not anticipated by the teachings of Horisawa. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-18 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-16

In Section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Williams *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,735; hereinafter referred to as "Williams"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

As discussed above, the structure of independent claim 1, as presented herein, discloses an information processing apparatus including "a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information", and "a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods". *Claim 1 (emphasis added).*

Although it seems Williams teaches having different processors to process different types of images, Williams fails to teach or suggest having a storage element that can store multiple

programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method from the different methods stored in the storage element.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Williams. Independent claims 8 and 15 are method and computer program claims, respectively, which include limitations that closely parallel, and are substantially similar to, the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, it is maintained claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by the teachings of Williams. Further, since claims 2-4, 9-11, and 16 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, it is maintained that claims 2-4, 9-11, and 16 are not anticipated by the teachings of Williams. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-16 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15

In Section 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Creswell *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,783; hereinafter referred to as "Creswell"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

As discussed above, the structure of independent claim 1, as presented herein, discloses an information processing apparatus including "a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information", and "a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods". *Claim 1 (emphasis added).*

Although it seems Creswell teaches a specialized processing system having at least one specialized processor, Creswell fails to teach or suggest having a storage element that can store

multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method from the different methods stored in the storage element.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Creswell. Independent claims 8 and 15 are method and computer program claims, respectively, which include limitations that closely parallel, and are substantially similar to, the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, it is maintained claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by the teachings of Creswell. Further, since claims 2 and 9 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, it is maintained that claims 2 and 9 are not anticipated by the teachings of Creswell. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 7, 14, and 19

In Section 23 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa *et al.* (EP0794663; hereinafter referred to as "Sokawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is submitted that claims 1, 8, and 15 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the teachings of the above-referenced prior art references. Since claims 7, 14, and 19 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, it is maintained that claims 7, 14, and 19 are not rendered obvious by the teachings of Sokawa. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 7, 14, and 19 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

PATENT
Serial No. 09/664,858
Attorney Docket No. 450100-02719

Newly-added claims 20 and 21

Since claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 1, it is submitted that claims 20 and 21 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the teachings of the above-referenced prior art references. Accordingly, claims 20 and 21 should also be allowable over the above-referenced prior art references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-21 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800